DOCKET NO.: 307340.01 / MSFT-3489
Application No.: 10/823,461
Office Action Dated: March 21, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

REMARKS

Claims 1, 19 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by Bent et al. (Publication No.: US 2004/0230911, filed October 23, 2003). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Applicants further submit that no new matter was introduced in the amendment of the claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1, 19 and 33 were rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §101, because the claimed invention was stated to be directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 1, 19 and 33 in view of the Examiner's constructive comments. As amended, claims 1, 19 and 33 are believed to be in condition to overcome the noted rejection given that they are all now claiming statutory subject matter. For example, independent claims 1 and 19 as amended recite a computer that stores and executes the binding statements. Independent claim 33 as amended recites a computer that executes a user interface program.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e)

Claims 1-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by Bent et al. (Publication No.: US 2004/0230911, filed October 23, 2003.

Independent claims 1, 19 and 33 recite a binding engine that receives a plurality of biding statements specified by declarative statements which are evaluated to determine the content to be displayed in a user interface. Furthermore, the binding engine, in, for example independent claim 1, establishes a priority order in which a plurality of binding statements are to be executed in order to bind a target to a source. In independent claim 19, a priority order is received indicating an order of execution of a plurality of binding statements, the first binding statement associated with a highest priority and the second binding statement associated with a next highest priority, evaluating the higher priority first binding statement and executing the first binding statement if the evaluation is successful. If the first binding

DOCKET NO.: 307340.01 / MSFT-3489
Application No.: 10/823,461
Office Action Dated: March 21, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

statement fails the evaluation, the second binding statement is automatically evaluated. In independent claim 33, a collection of binding statements is evaluated with a priority data binding engine for binding the target using a priority protocol to determine which one of the binding statements to use to determine content to be displayed in the user interface during execution of the user interface by a computer.

The cited Bent et al. reference teaches a system and method for controlling user interface properties with data including a way in which the binding specification is notified when a data value undergoes a change and the manner in which it directs the user interface to reflect the change. However, the cited Bent et al. reference fails to teach or suggest evaluation and execution based on a priority order as recited in independent claims 1, 19 and 33.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Bent et al. does not teach or suggest the following features from independent claim 1 (or corresponding features from independent claims 19 and 33):

> a binding engine executing on the computer, the binding engine
> establishing a priority order in which the plurality of binding statements are to
> be executed by the computer in order to bind the target to the source

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 19 and 33 are not anticipated by Bent et al.. Applicants further submit that claims 2-18, 20-32 and 34-40 are patentable at least be reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: 307340.01 / MSFT-3489
Application No.: 10/823,461
Office Action Dated: March 21, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: June 21, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/
Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439